APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/541,994	04/03/2000	J. Julian Paas	CA9-99-043	4706

7590 10/05/2005	EXAMINER	
DILLON & YUDELL LLP	BURGESS, BARBARA N	
8911 NORTH CAPITAL OF TEXAS HIGHWAY		
SUITE 2110	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78759	2157	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/541,994	PAAS, J. JULIAN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Barbara N. Burgess	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 July 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5,6 and 17-27* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5,6 and 17-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. *9-29-05* .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Amendments filed July 19, 2005. Claims 1-3, 5-6

are presented for further consideration. Claims 17-27 are presented for initial

examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1.   Claims 1-3, 5-6, 17-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sanders (US Patent No. 5,734,831) in view of Chiles et al.

(hereinafter "Chiles" US Patent 6,167,567)

As per claims 1 and 22, Sanders discloses a method and computer-usable medium

embodying computer program code of executing a software application, comprising the

steps of:

• Calling the software application residing on a server from one of a plurality of clients,

the clients and the server connected to each other through at least one network, the

software application having a plurality of policy frameworks, each associated with a

respective one of the plurality of clients (column 2, lines 65-67, column 3, lines 10-
16, column 6, lines 27-40, 60-67);

- Launching a container/desktop of one of the plurality of clients consistent with the
  respective policy framework of the one client, wherein the container/desktop
  includes a software for displaying a user-interface on a display in a computer
  (column 3, lines 18-26);

- The container/desktop initializing and communicating to the server to execute a
  script of the application (column 3, lines 28-40);

- Executing the script on the server, the script downloading a first user-interface
  component of the application to the container/desktop (column 5, lines 8-20);

- The container/desktop executing the first user-interface component (column 4, lines
  55-65, Figure 7);

- First user interface component linking to and starting a subsequent user-interface
  component of the script (column 5, lines 2-6, Figure 8).

Sanders does not explicitly disclose:

- In response to the subsequent user-interface component of the script being
  started, the software in the container/desktop automatically closing the first user-
  interface component and removing the first user-interface from a system memory
  in the computer.

However, in an analogous art, Chiles discloses closing the FTP connection via the
FTP interface. Once the FTP connection is terminated, an HTTP connection is
established using HTTP interface (column 22, lines 16-35).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would

have found it obvious to incorporate or implement closing a first interface in

response to opening another in Sander's method in order to establish another

connection with a different protocol.

As per claim 2, Sanders discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising the step

of said script starting and executing the user-interface components within a policy-

framework of the container/desktop (column 2, lines 65-67, column 3, lines 10-16).

As per claim 3, Sanders discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

- The container/desktop removing the user-interface components from memory within

  the client as each first and subsequent user-interface component is closed (column

  5, lines 22-24, Figures 7 and 8).

As per claim 4, Sanders discloses a method of executing an application having a

plurality of tasks to be interactively executed with a user, said method comprising:

- Downloading to a one of a plurality of container/desktops only those of a plurality of

  user-interface components consistent with a policy/framework of the one

  container/desktop, the user interface components stored on a server needed to

  perform a first task of the plurality of tasks of an application according to a script

  executing on the server (column 2, lines 65-67, column 3, lines 10-16, column 6,

  lines 27-40, 60-67);

- Downloading to the one container/desktop only those user-interface components stored on a server needed to perform a subsequent task of the plurality of tasks of an application according to the script (column 3, lines 18-26);

- Executing subsequent task on the one container/desktop (column 5, lines 2-6, Figure 8);

- Closing said downloaded user-interface components needed to perform the task when no longer needed (column 5, lines 22-24);

- Purging said closed user-interface components from said container/desktop when said closed user-interface components are no longer needed (column 5, lines 22-24, Figures 7 and 8);

- Repeating steps (c) and (d) (column 5, lines 10-14);

- Repeating steps (e) through (g) until all of the plurality of tasks is completed (column 5, lines 10-14).

As per claim 5, Sanders further discloses a computer server comprising:

- A processor, a memory, a bus, and at least one I/O port by which to communicate with a remote client having a container/desktop, wherein the container/desktop includes a software for displaying a user-interface on a display in a computer (column 1, lines 65-67, column 2, lines 1-5, 60-67)

- An operating system with which to coordinate the processor, the memory, the bus, and the at least one I/O port to communicate to the client (column 2, lines 1-5, 60-67);

- An application comprising a plurality of tasks to be executed on the container/desktop, the application stored in memory of and executing on the server (column 3, lines 32-40, column 5, lines 8-10);

- A script of the application stored in the memory of and executing on the server (column 4, lines 10-22, column 5, lines 8-10);

- A plurality of user-interface components stored in the memory, the script comprising code executing on the server to connect the user-interface components to comprise the application wherein the application launches the container/desktop on the client that interacts with the script executing on the server to download from the server to the container/desktop only those user-interface components required for a current task executing on the container (column 4, lines 10-47, column 5, lines 8-15).

Sanders does not explicitly disclose:

- In response to the subsequent user-interface component of the script being started, the software in the container/desktop automatically closing the first user-interface component and removing the first user-interface from a system memory in the computer.

However, in an analogous art, Chiles discloses closing the FTP connection via the FTP interface. Once the FTP connection is terminated, an HTTP connection is established using HTTP interface (column 22, lines 16-35).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate or implement closing a first interface in

response to opening another in Sander's method in order to establish another

connection with a different protocol.

As per claim 6, Sanders discloses a client device comprising:

- A container/desktop, wherein the container/desktop includes a software for

  displaying a user-interface on a display in a computer (column 3, lines 18-26);

- An I/O port with which to communicate to one or more servers having software

  applications invoking a plurality of tasks on the container/desktop, scripts, and user-

  interface components for the application (column 3, lines 28-35, 51-60);

- An interactive medium with which to interact with a user, wherein when the user

  uses the interactive medium to request an application from the server, the script and

  the application executing on the server downloads only user-interface components

  to the container/desktop needed by a current one of the plurality of tasks executing

  according to the script and and wherein the container/desktop discards the user-

  interface components no longer needed by the application (column 4, lines 51-67);

Sanders does not explicitly disclose:

- In response to the subsequent user-interface component of the script being

  started, the software in the container/desktop automatically closing the first user-

  interface component and removing the first user-interface from a system memory

  in the computer.

However, in an analogous art, Chiles discloses closing the FTP connection via the

FTP interface. Once the FTP connection is terminated, an HTTP connection is

established using HTTP interface (column 22, lines 16-35).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would

have found it obvious to incorporate or implement closing a first interface in

response to opening another in Sander's method in order to establish another

connection with a different protocol.

As per claim 17, Sanders discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the first user-interface component directly passes data to the subsequent user-interface component before the first user-interface component closes (column 3, lines 12-25).

As per claim 18, Sanders discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the first and subsequent user-interface components are decoupled from the software application, such that an execution context of the user-interface components can be changed without affecting application code in the software application (column 4, lines 3-13).

As per claim 19, Sanders discloses the method of claim 18, wherein the user-interface components are decoupled via a script on a server managing a contract between the script and a policy of the container/desktop (column 5, lines 15-40).

As per claim 20, Sanders discloses the method of claim 19, wherein the policy describes a number of tasks that can be simultaneously executed on a client computer (column 4, lines 23-45).

As per claim 21, Sanders discloses the method of claim 19, wherein the policy describes a visual policy on a client computer, and wherein the visual policy describes a position, sizing, and cropping of a user-interface component (column 6, lines 33-48).

As per claim 23, Sanders discloses the computer-usable medium of claim 22, wherein

the first user-interface component passes data to the subsequent user-interface

component before the first user-interface component closes (column 3, lines 12-24).

As per claim 24, Sanders discloses the computer-usable medium of claim 22, wherein

the first and subsequent user-interface components are decoupled from the software

application, such that an execution context of the user-interface components can be

changed without affecting application code in the software application (column 4, lines

3-13).

As per claim 25, Sanders discloses the computer-usable medium of claim 24, wherein

the user-interface components are decoupled via a script on a server managing a

contract between the script and a policy of the container/desktop (column 5, lines 15-

40).

As per claim 26, discloses the computer-usable medium of claim 25, wherein the policy

describes a number of tasks that can be simultaneously executed on a client computer

(column 4, lines 23-45).

As per claim 27, discloses the computer-usable medium of claim 25, wherein the policy

describes a visual policy on a client computer, and wherein the visual policy describes a

position, sizing, and cropping of a user-interface component (column 6, lines 33-48).

Response to Arguments

(a)   Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new

ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

2.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Barbara N. Burgess whose telephone number is (571)

272-3996. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306

for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-

3900.

Barbara N Burgess
Examiner
Art Unit 2157

September 29, 2005

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER